and (Edn) (1930) Department.

MS. SERIES.

G.O. No. 2100

DATED 11-10-1930

[Despatch Abstract.]

...sidy - Taluk Board, Udipi - Elementary School buildings - reconsideration of orders declining payment - refused.

Education **DEPARTMENT.**

Received GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 1- OCT 1930 LAW DEPT. 19 *Registered*

Subject.

Subsidy-construction of elementary school buildings Taluk Board, Udipi.

R.O.C. No. 1829 B/30

Station Madras, *Dated the* 30-9-1930 19

From (Name) R G Grieve Esq, M.A., C.I.E.,

(Designation) Ag. Director of Public Instruction

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Law (Education) Department.

Sir,

Ref:- Letter Ref. C. No. 137/30 Sup dated 11-9-30 from the President, Taluk, Board, Udipi

.....

Submitted with reference to G.O.No. 1464 MS Law (Education) dated 28th July 1930.

2. To the list of grounds on which the President's previous application was not supported in my letter communicated in the Government Order quoted above , I may add that the present financial stringency does not justify any reconsideration of the orders passed already.

for Director of Public Instruction

DEPARTMENT.



gistered ..... 19 .

Subject.

Buildings - Elementary school - construction - grant from the Government - Further application.

Ref C No. 137/30 Sep.
E.T.B

ation Udipi. *Dated the* 11th September 19 30

om (Name) M.R.Ry H.Ramayya Shetty Avl.,

(Designation) President, Taluk Board, Udipi.

o The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Law (Education) Department.

rough

d, The Director of Public Instruction,

M a d r a s.

rough

The President, District Board,

South Kanara.

r,

Referring to G.O.No. Ms. 1464 dated 28-7-1930, have the honour to state as follows : -

2. Want of suitable school buildings for Board ementary schools is a defect constantly reported by the Inspecting officers of the Educational department in their annual inspection reports of schools. The Taluk

has not been able to remedy this defect on account of financial stringency, which fact may be verified by a kind perusal of the budgets of the Taluk Board under both the Elementary and the General funds.

3. With a view to see whether anything could be done in this direction, I approached the villagers but found them quite adverse to pay any contribution for the purpose. However, with the greatest difficulty, I was able to get a few villagers who agreed to contribute in the shape of materials etc., for the buildings. Lest this promised contribution should also lapse, I, with good intention, had the works put in hand immediately, without waiting for the sanction of the Government. Moreover, it will not only set an example to others to follow their brother villagers but also the want of school buildings will be gradually supplied. I was full of hopes that the Director of Public Instruction who is in the know of things would lend me his full support in the matter; but to my sad disappointment, I find that, that officer recommended the total refusal of the grant on the technical ground of not having obtained prior approval of the Government, for the proposal. What have been mentioned above are facts. Such being the case, I do not know why the Director of Public instruction remarks that the reasons adduced by me for undertaking the works without Government sanction, are not convincing. But I respectfully beg to submit that one who knows the present trend of mind of the people towards public bodies will certainly feel the difficulties one has to face in the collection of contributions from private persons.

4. I do not know whether there is any rule that prevents local bodies from incurring expenditure from their Elementary Education funds towards the constructions of school buildings. But, provision of buildings being one of the conditions for recognizing schools, it's

The entire expenditure may be met from the L. B. funds, but if a subsidy is asked for, one-half of the cost should be met from the general revenues

seems to me that construction of school buildings is a legitimate charge on the Elementary Education fund.

5. I beg to state that the works were put in hand in anticipation of the receipt of the Government grant and in the interests of Elementary Education. If the Government were to refuse grant, the works so far undertaken will remain at a standstill and this will be a reflection on the administration, which is highly undesirable.

6. In the circumstances explained above, I request that the Government may be pleased to reconsider their order and to sanction as a special case subsidy equal to half the cost of the works.

7. A copy of Taluk Board resolution No. 289/ dated 6-8-1930 is enclosed.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Taluk Board of Udipi, dated 6th August 1930. *1924*

PRESENT:

M.R.Ry H.Ramayya Shetty Avl., President.

Doctor U.Ramachandra Rao, Vice President.

Rev.Father M.Minezes.

M.R.Ry A.Kalinga Hebbar Avl.,

" K.Narasimha Pai Avl.,

" K.Sannaya Hande Avl.,

" B,Krishnaya Hegde Avl.,

" K.Muddanna Shetty Avl.,

" T.Chandaya Shetty Avl.,

" Upendra Srinivasa Nayak Av

" U.Sadiya Marakala Avl.

A.S.Karat Esquire B.A.L.T.

M.R.Ry A.A.K.Ballal Avl.,

x

289. Read G.O.No. Ms. 1464 Law (Education) dated 28th July 1930, stating that the Government are unable to sanction any subsidy towards the construction of school buildings.

The Board requests the Government to reconsider the application.

x

(sd) H.Ramayya Shetty

President.

/True extract/

Udipi.)
)
11-9-1930.)

President,
Taluk Board,Udipi.

Endorsement by M.R.Ry Rao Bahadur B.Mahabala Hegde Avargal,B.A.B.L.President,District Board,South Kanara.

Submitted.

President,District Board,South Kanara.

Mangalore, 19.9 1930.

Sectt. II-5 (a)—50,006—5-11-29.

21/11.10

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied ..		
When examined ..		
When signed ..		
When despatched		

Hon DEPARTMENT.

Subsidy

Taluk Board, Udipi — Elementary school buildings — re-consideration of orders declining payment — regrdg

T. B, Udipi Roc No. 13 2-T.B/30 dated 11-9-1930.

Roc „ 18298/30 „ 30-9-1930.

2100, dated 11-10-1930

The Govt see no reason to re-consider the orders passed in GO No 1467 Law (Ex) D 9-8-30

2 With reference to paragraph 3 of his letter read above the P.T.B, Udipi is informed that there is no objection to the Board's meeting the entire cost of the building from the E.E. Fund but that if a subsidy is asked for from provincial funds, the Taluk Board should